REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE ACADEMIES AND HIGH SCHOOLS IN RELATIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NATHANIEL BUTLER
The University of Chicago

Early in the autumn of 1911, the University of Chicago inaugurated a plan of visitation in the pursuit of which invitations were sent to the secondary schools in co-operation with the University, opening to the teachers in these schools the classrooms of the Junior College for visits of inspection. This plan was explained somewhat in detail in an article by Dean Angell on "New Requirements for Entrance and Graduation at the University of Chicago," in the *School Review* for September, 1911. The purpose of this arrangement was to secure from teachers in the co-operating schools their opinions as to the degree in which the work as conducted in the Junior College classes is suitably related to the work offered in the classes preparing for college in the high schools. In response to the invitation, a good many visits were paid by high-school representatives to the classrooms of the University, and the April Conference consisted chiefly of the discussion of reports of these meetings in departmental groups on the afternoon of Friday, April 19, followed by a general discussion in a session of the whole on Saturday morning. Here follow the reports of the departmental sessions, made by the respective secretaries at the Saturday morning session.

BOTANY AND ZOÖLOGY

Chairman, H. H. PEPOON, Lake View High School, Chicago
Secretary, J. T. JOHNSON, Western State Normal School, Macomb, Illinois

The subject for discussion in this section was, "How can the courses in botany and zoölogy in the high schools and in the University be better related so that there will be an easier transition for the entering high-school students?"

The question proved to be a very interesting one and stimulated a free and general discussion in which nearly every teacher present stated frankly his views upon the present relationship between the high schools and the University. The question resolved itself into two chief points for discussion: first, the subject-matter which composes the content of the courses in botany and zoölogy offered by both the high schools and the University and, second, the methods of instruction employed by each school.

The discussions developed the fact that at present there is no uniformity of subject-matter in the present organization of the high-school courses in science. Some of the schools offer a very general course in science, while other schools specialize more or less in the departments of morphology, physiology, ecology, and taxonomy. With such a lack of uniformity among high schools it is difficult to harmonize the work of the University with the several high schools. Upon an examination of the courses in the University it is found that several variable courses are offered beginning students, all of which are more or less ill-adapted to the average high-school student. As an illustration of an extreme case, an instance was cited in which one of the beginning courses in the University was composed of students from each of the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior classes. It is very evident that a high-school student is not well adapted to enter such a class in the University. When such conditions prevail the necessity for some sort of adjustment of courses is readily seen.

A point relating to University administration was developed in the discussion. It was observed that students entering the courses offered in the departments of history, English, mathematics, and some other courses, would receive advanced standing for some high-school work when well done, while no advanced standing was offered for science subjects. All of the professors in attendance expressed a willingness to grant advanced standing for satisfactory work. It is desirable that an adjustment be made so that science students may enter upon the same basis as students entering other departments.

ENGLISH

Chairman, J. F. HOSIC, Teachers College, Chicago
Secretary, MARIAN LYONS, Wendell Phillips High School, Chicago

In the discussion of the afternoon, four questions of general interest were taken up. The first of these was the need of the Freshman for personal guidance, as he enters the University at a time in his life when he is still too immature to make alone the choice of such courses as will be in line with his own natural aptitudes. Help in these matters was held to be difficult by reason of the size of the University, but it was suggested that greater opportunities for contact could be provided for if students were placed under the charge of the same instructor for a longer time than is possible at present. Further discussion of this topic brought out the fact that the University fully recognizes the need of closer touch between the teacher and the student and has planned to gain it in the English work by reducing the size of classes in composition and by arranging for individual conferences.

The second topic to be discussed was the kind of ability and experience needed by the instructor to whom the work in Freshman classes is given. During the first year in college the student is in a critical position; he is then in need of expert help perhaps more than at a later time. The final outcome of the thought on this question led to a motion that the conference recommend to the University that Freshman English be taught by the most experienced and most efficient teachers on the staff.

A third topic given wide discussion was the question of the effectiveness of the lecture method with Freshmen. By some it was believed that this method stood in the way of close acquaintance between the instructor and his pupils: that it was not so effective as other methods, as it called infrequently upon the student for self-expression; that the instructor who depended largely upon it, often failed to develop in himself the art of questioning. General interest was exhibited in this topic and it culminated in a resolution asking the University and high schools to submit the lecture method to some kind of scientific investigation to discover the truth with regard to its effectiveness.

The fourth point concerned the necessity of professional training

for graduates who intend to teach, since a fine scholar is not necessarily a good teacher and may be more interested in his subject for itself than in its relation to the pupil. A motion was made that the Board of Recommendation be asked to recommend for positions to teach English only those graduates who have had professional training.

Topics of minor interest discussed were the impropriety of the use of slang in classrooms, the need of more work in oral composition, and the value of modern literature as reading material.

FRENCH

Chairman, EARLE B. BABCOCK, The University of Chicago
Secretary, FRANCES R. ANGUS, University High School

Reports were made by some of those who had visited the work of the Junior College. The following points were brought out:

1. The classes taught in French were for the most part well done: the instructor knew the language that he was teaching, he had his matter well in hand, and he did not waste the student's time.

2. On the other hand classes had been observed where much time was wasted, where the instructor did not know the language, and did not have the matter well in hand. Some of the classes were taught in English.

3. Also it is often difficult or impossible for the student in the Senior College to continue his work in French (hearing and speaking it). Yet this student may be teaching French in the immediate future.

General discussion followed some of the points involved:

The teaching of French in French was warmly advocated by several present: (1) because it is absolutely due to the student who thinks that he is learning the language; (2) because it is more economical of the student's time; (3) because it gives interest to the work.

It was objected that some students desire only a reading knowledge of the language. The suggestion was made that the University have special classes for those students. Mr. Sicard and

Miss Angus had found that the reading knowledge is gained more quickly by administering the material in French. It was also stated by Mr. House that good results had been obtained by giving the early work in English, and then using French in the classroom, once the elements were established.

GERMAN

Chairman, CHARLES E. MANLEY, Englewood High School, Chicago
Secretary, E. H. SCHULZ, Lane Technical High School, Chicago

The discussion of the conference can easily be grouped under six heads:

1. Repetition of some high-school work in college: Some of the written reports that had been received from visiting teachers had objected to this feature, but the unanimous opinion of the Conference was that in the German department no such criticism could be made. Repetition was held rather advisable under certain conditions and preferable to putting a student ahead of his real ability to profit by the work of any given course. Even the reading of some high-school texts, such as Schiller's *Tell*, can be made very profitable, providing the outlook is a different one. Although this would depend upon the nature of the text and would perhaps not apply to such an elementary text as *Immensee*.

2. Entrance requirements have no doubt brought about a greater uniformity, which was thought to be better than none, though it might be somewhat one-sided.

3. A closer acquaintance between high-school and college teachers was urged as being necessary to a better understanding of existing conditions in the two schools.

4. The college course, known as German IV, was recommended as the most suitable one for the average student entering the University with two years of German to his credit, because it provides just the review of essentials necessary before broadening out into new fields.

5. Suggestion and co-operation between the two schools is a thing very much to be desired, so long as it does not take the form of minute description and prescription of methods. In connection

with this phase of the subject it was urged that instructors from both institutions get together and issue larger suggestive reading lists.

6. The question of credits given for high-school work proved an interesting one. It developed that upon certification the University will give two unit credits for two years of high-school German, but in the examination plan the questions are generally such as to require two years of preparation in high school, for which work however only one unit credit is allowed. This therefore seems to favor the certification plan. And it was the opinion of all those speaking on this topic that the one-unit plan was perhaps proper and that no more should be allowed for the same amount of work under the certificate plan.

GEOLOGY

Chairman, JAMES H. SMITH, Austin High School, Chicago
Secretary, LYDIA SMEDLEY, Joliet High School, Joliet, Illinois

In the discussion of the topic, "Is the Basis Established by College Work in the High Schools Carefully Built Upon?" Miss Marion Finney, Township High School, Joliet, Illinois, stated that there is no discrimination in the University classes between students who have taken the work in high school and those who begin the work at the University.

In a paper entitled, "Tendencies in Courses in Physiography and Factors Which Determine Them," Miss Grace F. Ellis of the Central High School, Grand Rapids, Michigan, showed that the tendency at the present time is toward the industrial and commercial aspect.

Mr. George J. Miller of the University High School raised the question: Would it not be desirable to encourage more high-school courses in geography in order to broaden the outlook in geographical lines and thus attract teachers who are more fully equipped for the work?

The following resolutions were adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That field and laboratory work offers an opportunity for university and high-school teachers to come in close personal touch with their pupils. Realizing that this personal contact vitalizes the entire work of the course, the Conference recommends that this work should not be left too much in the hands of graduate students.

2. *Resolved*, That the Conference recommends that the University teachers be requested to collect data regarding the efficiency of their pupils in order to discover: (*a*) What difference, if any, is found in the University between pupils who had physiography in the first or second year in high school and those who had it in the third or fourth year. (*b*) What difference, if any, is found in the University between pupils who had physiography for a full year in high school and those who had it for a half-year.

3. *Resolved*, That the Conference recommends that the University use its influence among high schools, to the effect that, unless physiography can be taught by one who has had training in that line, it should not be taught at all.

4. *Resolved*, That the Conference recommends that the University use its influence among high schools to encourage the establishment of a department of geography which shall include courses in commercial, industrial, and economic geography, in addition to the course in physiography.

HISTORY AND CIVICS

Chairman, H. V. CHURCH, Cicero Township High School, Clyde, Illinois
Secretary, J. H. NEWLON, High School, Decatur, Illinois

Written reports by teachers who had visited history classes in the University were read, following which other teachers who had visited classes made oral reports upon their observations. The discussion was informal but spirited, and took a wide range. It was found that the observations made by the visitors had suggested many problems, particularly as to method. The following resolutions were adopted:

1. In order to secure the personal contact with the instructor and the undivided attention so essential to students just entering the university, we recommend that Junior College classes in history be limited to thirty students.

2. Whereas the amount of collateral reading done in the high school rarely reaches a minimum of fifty pages per week even in the Senior year, we feel that great care should be taken not to overload the student with reading in the beginning of his college course. As secondary teachers we feel that greater emphasis, both in high school and college, should be put upon the character of the reading and not so much upon mere totals of pages.

3. We desire heartily to commend the manner in which the teachers in the University are endeavoring, sometimes in the face of large classes, to reach the individual student and to adapt the work to his peculiar needs.

4. We highly commend the excellent spirit that prevails between the instructor and student, especially in the Junior College. In this very important respect, if this condition holds throughout the University, there should be no great chasm between the high school and the University.

LATIN

Chairman, JOHN H. HEIL, High School, Morgan Park, Illinois
Secretary, W. L. CARR, University High School

Two papers were presented, one by Mr. Walter Johnson, of the Lane Technical High School, on "The Co-ordination of Secondary-School Latin and College Latin," the other by Miss Laura Wright, of the Lake High School, on "The Secondary School Recitation vs. The College Recitation."

The first paper took up two questions: (1) To what extent is the secondary work duplicated in the college classes? (2) Is the basis established for college classes on the part of the secondary school carefully built upon? In answer to the first it was shown that there was no duplication in subjects offered, though there were sub-Freshman classes for those who entered with only two years' credit in Latin.

In discussing the second question it was pointed out that any new class in college, whether Freshman or sub-Freshman, is decidedly heterogeneous.

The reports of the visitors of college classes indicated that this problem is being attacked from a practical standpoint. It would greatly aid if the teachers of secondary Latin could agree upon a greater uniformity in the preparation of their students for college work, at any rate upon a *minimum* of accomplishment on which the college instruction could count with absolute certainty. The writer of the paper gave some valuable suggestions in methods urging a more scientific attitude on the part of the teacher as the only means of fostering that attitude in the students.

In the general discussion which followed, Professor Miller declared his belief in the possibility of agreeing upon an *irreducible minimum*, to be required at the end of two, or three, or four years' work in secondary Latin. Miss Sabin of the Oak Park High School told of the use in this school of printed outlines giving forms, syntax, and vocabulary required for each year's work. Professor Chandler urged the value of oral work as a means of getting at Latin idiom and acquiring a vocabulary. Miss Bassett of the Parker High School told of successful work in oral composition. Professor Hale stated his conviction that the day of dictation of

colleges to schools had passed, and expressed his gratification that the college and the schools were sitting down together to talk it over, the college being more than willing to listen to the schools.

Miss Misener of Kenwood Institute insisted that, whoever was responsible for it, the reading requirement, especially in Caesar, was too great to allow for even a minimum of scientific linguistics, oral work, and other such desirable features, and Miss Zimmerman of the Marshall High School joined in the demand for a smaller requirement than four books of Caesar.

Professor Hale said that he had strongly urged the Committee of Fifteen to reduce the requirement by the omission of the last half of Book I. He made an appeal for more "insurgency" on the part of teachers, and said that one reason why teachers fail to cultivate in their students the much-to-be-desired ability to observe and think independently is that the teachers themselves are too often *bound to a book*. A scientific attitude is as desirable and as possible in elementary Latin as in elementary physical science, and this attitude involves an openness of mind toward new points of view and new terminology.

Miss Faulkener of the Faulkener Schools spoke of the danger of dwelling too much on formal syntax and urged cultivating in our students the ability to understand and translate. She insisted that the ability to read at sight is a better test than adeptness in affixing the proper names to constructions.

Miss Lewis, of Bowen High School, expressed the wish that the *three-fourths* of high-school Latin pupils who, as is shown by statistics, take only two years of Latin, might have a more attractive course than at present and this expression brought out the perennial discussion of the value of the traditional requirement of four books of Caesar as against any possible substitutes for at least a part of the second year's reading.

Miss Laura Wright's paper was a compilation of, and comment on, reports from teachers who had visited University classes. She pointed out the unreliableness of conclusions formed as a result of a single visit. In general the reports were favorable to the University instructors. On sub-Freshman work in college the reports were less favorable. Perhaps largely because of the great variation

in the pupils, the lapse of time, and the fact that usually only poorer pupils thus finish their preparatory Latin in college, the work in Cicero and Vergil classes was found not so good as that of the ordinary high-school classes in those subjects.

Three resolutions were unanimously adopted:

One offered by Professor Miller that those present should constitute a committee of the whole, each to make out for himself and try in his own school a definite outline of minimum requirements for each year's work, and report the results at the conference next year.

A second resolution, offered by Principal Swain, was that a committee of five be appointed, with Miss Sabin as chairman, to gather these individual reports by March first, and to present a combined report next April.

A further resolution was offered by Professor Miller that a committee of five be appointed to consider the advisability of a permanent organization of the Latin Departmental Conference. Professor Miller, Principal Swain, Miss Zimmerman, Mr. Johnson, and Miss Mary Lewis were appointed by the chairman.

MANUAL TRAINING

Chairman, WILLIAM J. BOGAN, Lane Technical High School, Chicago
Secretary, WILSON H. HENDERSON, Technical High School, Springfield, Illinois

The Manual Training Departmental Conference, attended by about fifty teachers, devoted the entire session to the consideration of questions suggested by the following resolution:

Resolved, That the public secondary schools should admit to their courses pupils of high-school age even when such pupils have not had all the requirements usually imposed on the elementary schools, provided the pupils can benefit by the work given in these courses.

After a prolonged discussion the resolution was passed without a dissenting vote. Three major considerations seem to have led the conference to this conclusion.

1. Manual-training teachers are vitally interested in the present movement for industrial education. They have observed that the new industrial schools are succeeding with a considerable proportion of their pupils, most of whom have been considered failures in the traditional schools.

2. This failure, in the absence of special vocational schools, results in the elimination of a majority of the children before the secondary school is reached. This raises the question whether modifying the entrance requirements of the secondary school would not give the superior advantages of a high-school education to a much larger number of children than we are now reaching.

3. There is a growing interest in the reorganization of our system of elementary and secondary schools. Emphasis was given to this point by quoting the following extract from President Judson's address delivered before the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools:

> It seems therefore that somewhere in our system there is a wastage of at least two years and possibly more. In the first place the elementary school as usually organized implies eight grades extending from the sixth year. I do not believe that eight grades are necessary. At the most this work should be done in seven years and I think it could be done in six years. We do altogether too much teaching at that age. The primary requirement for a child in those years is that he be a healthy, happy, busy little animal. He should learn some things which he can use in the way of reading and writing and number work, and the use of his hands in various ways, and in observation. We must remember education is by no means all the result of schooling. The child gets education at home and in his total environment. Moreover his mind is improving and getting power by the mere process of growth. The school is only one therefore among the factors.

While as above stated the main resolution was adopted unanimously, at the same time it was frankly recognized that difficulty will be encountered in any attempt to work out its practical application. The phases of the subject suggested by the following questions were given especial consideration:

Should not maturity and general ability be considered important qualifications for entrance to the secondary school?

Would it not be well to extend secondary-school work downward so as to include the essentials now given in the seventh and eighth grades; and upward to include the essentials now given in the first and possibly the second year of college work, all to be made so compact and definite as to save one or more years of the period between these extremes?

Should we plan some courses with the understanding that they will not lead to college?

Will the college penalize secondary schools which adopt these suggestions?

At the close of the Conference two motions were passed:

That the Conference submit to the University of Chicago the following questions: If a careful application of the resolution as adopted should be made by a secondary school, what would be the attitude of the University regarding the credit of that school?

That the Conference recommend that the University of Chicago appoint a committee, equally representative of the University and the high schools, to work out a plan by which this resolution may be applied without affecting the standing of the high school with the University.

MATHEMATICS

Chairman, W. P. MORGAN, The Western Illinois Normal School, De Kalb, Illinois

Secretary, W. W. HART, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

The Mathematics Conference was distinctly interesting and profitable. There were present about fifty persons, of whom two were members of the department of mathematics of the University. The program followed the printed official program for the meeting. The following report is a summary of the papers and discussions of the afternoon.

It was pointed out that so far as college-entrance requirements and graduation requirements are concerned, every provision seems to have been made for perfect articulation, but that the cases of failure on the part of Freshmen students indicated some flaw in the provisions. In the discussion that followed it became apparent that the percentage of actual failures in the Freshman year is no greater than in many high-grade high schools, in fact, not so great; and that too much attention was being given to the question of failures. Attention was directed to the fact that as a rule students in the University maintain the relative standing that they had in their high-school classes.

The question was raised, "Does the University require too much of the students?" This question was answered in the negative, at least so far as subject-matter is concerned. Many students who do only fair work in the high school are able to meet the University requirements and in some cases attain rather good standing by reason of their faithfulness in study. In some cases part of the

work in the Freshman year is a direct review of subject-matter that has been considered in the high school, especially in college algebra. This review was recognized as necessary by all present, because of the variety of training which students coming from many schools have had.

"Are the failures to be attributed to differences in method?" Most of those who visited University classes in mathematics gave special attention to the manner in which classes were conducted. Surprise was expressed that so little equipment such as compasses, rulers, models, cross-ruled blackboard, etc., was provided for the elementary classes—equipment that is considered quite necessary from the standpoint of the high school. The students did not seem to exhibit the interest and spontaneity that is characteristic of a well-conducted high-school class. The instructors, showing without question entire acquaintance with their subject, gave evidence of interest in their students, and were helpful and sympathetic.

Upon one question all of the visitors expressed themselves: "Do the University instructors stimulate their students to the full use of their powers?" Do they conduct the classes in a vigorous manner, designed to call for a maximum of effort on the part of the students? Do they plan their work so as to utilize to the greatest advantage the class time and study time of the students? The general feeling on the part of those who visited the University was that the weakness, if any, in the articulation of the work in good high schools with that of the University lies here. The remarks which follow are inserted as expressing in detail this feeling of the high-school teachers. No one of the remarks was made with respect to all of the instructors visited; in the main, no direct reference was made to individual instructors.

Much that was done by the instructor could be done by the students themselves. New ideas were presented in some cases in the form of a lecture. The lectures were criticized as differing from the text in use in the class, with the result that the students, unable to grasp a rapidly given lecture, were unable to utilize their study time to advantage. The lectures were criticized as being unnecessary in some cases, as consisting of theory that is given adequately in the texts, theory which the students could well be expected to get by themselves. It was remarked that exercises

more difficult than this theory were assigned without any suggestions. In other cases, new ideas were taken up well in a modified lecture form, the class co-operating with the instructor in the development. Aside from the development of general principles, the customary plan seems to be to assign problems for solution outside of classes and to discuss these problems at the ensuing meeting. The criticism was made that this discussion of the study assignment was not always a discriminating one; that the methods used were not designed to reach the individual members of the class; that students interested in the subject would probably profit, but that others might not find themselves very uncomfortable. On the other hand, in some classes, the class period was devoted to a vigorous drill upon exercises similar to those that had been assigned, with very evident success and interest on the part of the members of the class.

The question was raised whether the high school may not be guilty of turning out students lacking initiative, and whether it may not be the function of the University to offer its advantages especially to those who have desire for and capacity to do the work as given in the University. The general feeling was that if this is the function of the University, there should be a transition from the régime of the high school, involving a high degree of stimulus from without, to the régime of the University where the stimulus is supposed to come from within the student himself. It was apparent that under the more expert instructors in the University this view is held and is reflected in their teaching procedure.

By way of summary, it is apparent, but not at all surprising, that the instructors in the University are, in cases, being charged with many of the faults and, in other cases, are being credited with some of the virtues of high-school instructors; that there is evidently need that the University instructors give attention to the methods of teaching their subject, just as there has been and is need that high-school teachers consider the same problem; that special effort should be made to get all students to do their best; that a more systematic and scientific study should be made of the cases of failure among Freshmen, to determine whether the failure is due to lack of preparation or to other causes.

PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY

Chairman, PAUL G. W. KELLER, High School, Appleton, Wisconsin
Secretary, A. C. NORRIS, High School, Rockford, Illinois

Our aim was to state briefly what a high-school teacher considers should be taught in the high-school physics and chemistry classes, and to investigate carefully and find out what the University expects of the high schools.

Mr. Willis E. Tower of the Englewood High School said that he considers the development of the pupil is coming to be more clearly recognized as the great problem. Boys and girls and not subject-matter is the first consideration in our program. Physics is largely a subject of natural phenomena fixed by exact laws and principles. Instead of beginning our subject with force, acceleration, velocity, and energy, we should get our young friends interested in the phenomena which lead up to an understanding of these more abstract terms. When you have taken a class out and dropped a brick from the highest point of the school building to the ground, and they have watched its descent, then you are ready to teach and they are anxious to study the laws of falling bodies, acceleration, momentum, inertia, impact, force, gravitation, the value of g, and kinetic and potential energy. Physics offers a chance to do quantitative experiments. We are continually asking quantitative questions in life. How old are you? How tall is this building? What horse-power has the engine? What does it cost? How much will you give me for a year's work? How much did your football team score last season? In our high-school physics laboratory we should train our boys and girls to find answers to some definite, clear-cut problems. Whether it be twenty or forty of these problems matters but little, provided the pupil does well and understandingly the ones he attempts. Quality, not quantity, is what counts in quantitative work of any kind.

Matthew F. Wadleigh of the East Division High School, Milwaukee, defined the high-school chemistry course. Commence with some common thing like water and have the class work with it. Distil it, evaporate it, dissolve substances in it, break it up with sodium and electricity, make it by burning hydrogen in air. By the time a class has studied water just a little bit, they have

had to consider many of the laws and principles of chemistry. Teach them manipulation of apparatus, the chemical names and symbols of the compounds used and met with in the laboratory of life. Have enough quantitative experiments to teach the pupils accurate and skilful manipulation. Then when the student comes to the University he will know the difference between a flask and a beaker, he will know something about ionization, the law of definite proportion, and it is hoped he will know a great deal about the common tests, the composition of water, air, foods, and other common compounds.

Mr. H. R. Smith, of the Deerfield Township High School, Highland Park, Illinois, investigated and gave a report of the demands which the University instructors are making upon the students of physics. Mr. J. W. Morrison of the Riverside Brookfield High School, Riverside, Illinois, made a similar report as regards chemistry. Both have visited the classes in the University and talked with the students. Mr. Smith prepared a questionnaire of seventeen questions, which he had the students fill out. We give one question and an answer made by one student: "Has the attitude of your instructor been one of sympathetic interest in your difficulties, or have you been left to fight your battles alone?"

> I may say that I have almost never found an instructor who was not sympathetic and ready to help when I went to him with my troubles, whether in line with studies or otherwise. Oftentimes students, especially in a big place like this, hesitate to go to their instructors with their troubles. Sometimes this is due to the instructor's attitude, but more often to a natural hesitancy of the student. If there were only some way to bridge the chasm between the student and instructor it seems to me that the problems of both would vanish into thin air. In my own experience I have found that the least inviting instructor, the kind who makes your knees knock together when you think of approaching him, has always been most kind and most sympathetic.

Mr. Morrison reports the same thing true of the chemistry instructors. The "sink-or-swim" idea he finds entirely absent. If a pupil fails, it is largely on account of other things than the attitude of the instructor to the student. It may be sickness, poor preparation, lack of ability, or lack of application. In the last case, however, everything is done which can be to spur the student on to his best efforts.

This report closed with a summary emphasizing the human element in teaching Freshmen and the need that college instructors remember that even elementary matters require definition, and commending the University for its sympathetic attention to these considerations in the conduct of its Junior College classes.

At the conclusion of the reading of the reports a general discussion was held on the plan of the visitation of classes. Various speakers expressed the opinion that the visiting of University classes had been both profitable and pleasant and was a feature to be encouraged. The opinion was also expressed that it is as desirable that the University instructors visit classes in the secondary schools as that the high-school teachers visit University classes. Mr. C. P. Briggs, principal of the Rockford High School, expressed himself as in favor of inviting University instructors to come to his school and take charge of classes for a few days or even for a week if the instructors could spare the time. Such a plan was disapproved by Mr. H. B. Loomis, the principal of Hyde Park High School. He stated that he was one of the persons who resented strongly dictation of any sort from a university or college. If a weak point in his methods was pointed out to him he would consider the criticism and if he thought it just, he would take steps to strengthen the weak point. But he would not vote for any plan which provided for the taking charge of high-school classes by University instructors. An exchange of teachers was also suggested: University instructors taking charge of high-school classes, and high-school teachers taking charge of University classes.

Professor F. J. Miller said he felt certain that University instructors would be very glad to accept the invitation of high-school principals to visit their schools, but recommended that these invitations be personal.

The suggestion was made by Mr. J. F. Hosic, and favorably commented upon by Dean Angell, that in coming to the University to visit classes the teachers have in mind a somewhat definite plan or outline of what they expect to see presented, rather than coming with no particular purpose in view and simply taking things as they come.

The suggestion was also made that the heads of departments be brought into closer touch with the Freshmen. The men who conduct Freshmen classes are usually men who are new in the field, whereas the Freshman should be in charge of an instructor who has had wide experience and who is a scholar in the particular line in which he has specialized. In referring to this point, Dean Angell said that the statement in the report of the secretary of the Geology Conference that a good scholar is not necessarily a good teacher was in his judgment very true. The University recognizes the fact that the Freshman needs a particular type of instructor, and while an earnest endeavor is being made to place the so-called "juicy human beings" in charge of Freshman classes, it is also to be remembered that the number of these persons in a given department is limited—and apparently there is no limit to the number of Freshmen. As to the matter of conducting Freshman classes by heads of departments, it is not a secret that some of the heads of departments and leading professors are not even allowed to see a Freshman—men who are able scholars, but who would fail egregiously if placed in charge of a Freshman class.

As a result of the plan of visitation, it was recommended by Mr. Swain that the University of Chicago be requested to ask each one of its instructors who conduct Freshman classes to visit the classes of six high-school teachers in not less than two separate high schools in the state. The recommendation was approved.

On motion by Mr. Hosic, it was voted that the Program Committee make provision for a systematic study of the educational problems presented at the Departmental Conferences, and report them at the next Conference.

The Conference voted that the representatives of the academies and high schools on the Program Committee for next year be as follows: C. P. Briggs, High School, Rockford, Illinois; George Buck, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis; Dora Wells, Lucy Flower Trade School for Girls, Chicago; J. C. Hanna, High School, Oak Park, Illinois; H. C. Brown, New Trier High School, Kenilworth, Illinois.